

Appl. No. 09/840,210  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of October 15, 2003

Page 5 of 8

### REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 are rejected, claims 1, 2, and 4 are amended, and claim 9-17 are withdrawn by the Examiner.

#### Phone Conference with Examiner:

The undersigned attorney reminds the Examiner about their phone conference on November 24, 2003 regarding the finality of the October 15, 2003 Office action. To refresh the Examiner's memory, the "Office Action Summary" sheet provides that the Office action is not final. However, the "conclusion" portion of the October 15 Office action provides that the Office action is final. In view of this confusion, the Applicant asks the Examiner to remove the finality of the October 15, 2003 Office action.

#### Election

The Applicant notes the constructive election asserted in the October 15, 2003 Office action. Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw that election and to examine claims 9-15.

#### Objection to the Specification

The Office action objects to the specification. The Office action provides that the specification only supports 30 degrees Fahrenheit, not 30 degrees Celsius, as indicated by the Examiner. The Applicant reviewed the specification and only found reference to 30 degrees when discussing the Kelvin temperature below a strain point. Applicant did not find Fahrenheit, and notes that 30 degrees Kelvin below some point is exactly the same as 30 degrees Celsius below that point.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Atty. Docket NoNL-0000191

Appl. No. 09/840,210  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of October 15, 2003

Page 6 of 8

**Objection to claims 3 and 6**

The Office Action objects to claims 3 and 6. After reviewing our file copy of the Amendment mailed on 7/17/03, Applicant cannot find the asserted issues. Applicant suggests the possibility of discrepancies between the Patent Office copy and the file copy. Rather than correct an unseen error, an action that might create more problems, Applicant requests the Examiner to accept the claim listing provided above. Alternatively, the Applicant asks the Examiner to send copies of claims 3 and 6 so that well-reasoned amendments can be made.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 3 and 6 is respectfully requested.

**Rejections of Claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office action rejects claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant amends claims 1 and 4 as indicated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

**Rejections of Claims 1, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Torok, US Patent 3,258,324. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing a display tube by press-forming a glass panel to have inner corners, and then cooling the formed glass panel such that the surface temperatures of the inner corners remain below a strain point temperature.

Torok discloses a glass pressing apparatus that can control the heat distribution of a formed glass article. However, Torok does not teach or suggest forming a glass panel and then cooling that panel such that the inner corners remain below a strain point as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1-8 are respectfully requested.

Atty. Docket NoNL-0000191

Appl. No. 09/840,210  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of October 15, 2003

Page 7 of 8

**Rejections of Claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Iribarne et al. (US 4,826,522) in view of Littleton et al. (US Patent 2,285,596). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

d'Iribarne et al. discloses a method of making tempered glass sheets having reinforced edge stresses. Those edge stresses are formed by cooling the edges faster than the remainder of the sheet. In contrast, claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing a display tube by press-forming a glass panel to have inner corners (not edges) and then cooling the formed glass panel such that that the surface temperatures of the inner corners remain below a strain point during cooling.

Even if the principles of d'Iribarne et al. were applied to a display tube, the result would be stressed edges but unstressed inner corners. While the edges might be strengthened, residual heat in the thick glass corners would stress-relieve the glass panel, leaving it subject to tensile damage.

Littleton et al. does nothing to close the substantial gap between claim 1 and d'Iribarne et al. Littleton et al. discloses a method of tempering glass using repeated quenching. Combining the quenching method of Littleton et al. with the edge tempering of d'Iribarne et al. might be possible as a method of edge tempering, but it does not suggest a method of press-forming a display tube and then cooling inner corners such that the inner corner surface temperature remains below a strain point temperature.

Consequently, since claim 1 is patentable over the combination of d'Iribarne et al. and Littleton et al., claims 3 and 4, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Atty. Docket NoNL-0000191

Appl. No. 09/840,210  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of October 15, 2003

Page 8 of 8

**Rejections of Claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Iribarne et al. (US 4,826,522) and as evidenced by Littleton et al. (US Patent 2,285,596). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of d'Iribarne et al. and Littleton et al. Consequently, claims 2, 5, and 6, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**


The Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly requested.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone call would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call Mr. Eric Bram at (914) 333-9635 or John M. Kelly at (732) 530-9404. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the address of record (not to the signing attorney).

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or if any additional fees are required, kindly charge that fee to deposit account number 20-0782.

Respectfully submitted,

Dec 1, 2003

  
John M. Kelly, Attorney  
Reg. No. 33,920  
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

Atty. Docket NoNL-0000191